2/27/70

Dear Harold,

Your 2/25 to me with the pictures came today.

SLIDES: There are several things I want on color slides for many reasons. One, it clearly shows what is lead and what is copper, what is and is not foreign to the bullet which, in black and white, could appear as part of the bullet substance. It also shows, if done properly, if any blood or flesh remains in the tiny spaces of irregular surfaces such as the 399 base.

BISHOP: From the enclosed materials, you should see the extent of my knowledge on what I suggested in my Bishop notes. I have reread (as you suggested) what you wrote on Sibert-O'Neill in WWII and have not found anything bearing on this. However, in their report, there is something as is put forth in my letter.

McNeil and ALLMAN: Perhaps it is not yet proven that this was Oswald (and could it ever be? Like with Mrs. Arnold). However, what does this do to the Commission's contention that Oswald fled the TSBD so to arrive at the Tippit scene on time? To me, the evidence as stated in the SS report on that is "persuasive." However, I would not use it other than to show the deceit behind the Report here.

SPECTER: I know that this is a complex question. Whether you realize it or not, what Specter did with Shaneyfelt is more obvious and more conclusive than what he did with Humes as you say in PMI. You must realize that what he said in the memorandum about the lung bruises could have been an error on his part--a misunderstanding on what Humes told him. This, at least, is a back alley for him. However, on the time of the first shot, the memorandum is specific adn even goes into detail--exact opposite of the later Shaneyfelt test taken by Specter--and it is on a material point and certainly not ambiguous. Although you have not seen it, I have already written on this for my book.

Despite all of this, what I am currently working on is a pretty clear-cut case except for one detail which I am making efforts to resolve. Specter did too, and that is what will hang him here(figuratively). It is a seemingly minor point, one which everyone has missed. Again, Specter did not. As he left the record, Humes perjured himself, and Specter, through an unsuccessful but misleading attempt, revealed that he was aware of it. If I get answers to my inquiries on this point, then it could possibly exculpate Humes--but not Specter.

Sorry to be so vague, but I don't want to say any more on this (or even what it concerns) until I can be sure.

JFK BACK WOUND: I did measure this on my father sitting up, although you did not see the picture(it is enclosed). On the difference in neck lengths, look at the various pictures of JFK's back at love field and in the car (Curry book, pp. 28, 41, Betzner picture, others). You can plainly see that he had a very short "neck". This is one reason why I have no interest in getting measurements from tailor. This will not tell us what the neck compressed to in a prone position. And what is the "neck" in reference to where it begins and where it ends--that is just too vague. I expressed in the memo how I could not be precise about the scapula and the acromion measurements, but in light of the distance below the mastoid, these seem minor. I also did this with my dad's arms lifted up over his head as he was laying down, which produced a minor variation (also on enclosed photo).

You further say that I am duplicating your work. As for the scope of my present knowledge, I must take issue. As you know, I intend to discuss the wounds in my book. I know from you the location of the back wound, but I cannot and will not use that. However, I cannot ignore it either--i.e., I will not say that the wound could possibly be in a place which I know it was not. What I did was to corroborate your info with a test of my own. This is what I had planned to use in my work.

Again, I ask, have you ever conducted such a test, and if so, on who? Were photos taken? If you have not done this, then I fail to see how I am duplicating your work. (For the time being--that is prior to publication--you and Dick are the only ones in on this). I hope you see where I am confused. I am not using your materials (at least those of which I am aware of you having), although it was your materials which inspired me to do what I did.

As for the shirt slits, you must also understand that I went about this all independent of you, even if your efforts now parallel my own. But once I saw the significance of the quote Dick showed me which placed the wound above the shirt, I really became interested in those slits. And I did everything I could to find out if there ever was a bullet hole there--including writing Hoover. I also tried for pictures all on my own. And there are my tests here which, again, no one to my knowledge has done before. Remember also the efforts each of us made to get the Harper slides even before we knew each other. To my knowledge, it was I who discovered (from Hoover) that these were requested and turned over to the WC.

You are right that this is a ticklish area. I have a feeling that perhaps we are not conveying what we mean to say. What confuses me is exactly how you think I am duplicating your back wound work. Also, do not get uneasy over this for it is a matter which I'm sure can be resolved as long as neither of us holds back what we have to say.

FISHER: Am anxious to see what he answered. Dick should be sending me a copy soon.

I really must go. Don't be offended by this back wound stuff and don't get upset over it. We will work it out.

Best wishes,

Jonald

cc Dick

P.S. - PLEASE RETURN ENCLOSED PICTURES.

JR.